UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.            | FILING DATE                 | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR   | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/664,273                 | 09/18/2000                  | Jean-Claude Constantin | TSW-32978           | 4537             |
| PEARNE & GO                | 7590 02/02/200<br>ORDON LLP | EXAMINER               |                     |                  |
| 1801 EAST 9T<br>SUITE 1200 | H STREET                    | LAO, LUN S             |                     |                  |
|                            | ОН 44114-3108               | ART UNIT               | PAPER NUMBER        |                  |
|                            |                             |                        | 2614                |                  |
|                            |                             |                        |                     |                  |
|                            |                             |                        | MAIL DATE           | DELIVERY MODE    |
|                            |                             |                        | 02/02/2009          | PAPER            |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s)            |  |  |
|-----------------|-------------------------|--|--|
| 09/664,273      | CONSTANTIN, JEAN-CLAUDE |  |  |
|                 |                         |  |  |
| Examiner        | Art Unit                |  |  |

|  | LUN-SEE LAO  | 2014   |  |
|--|--|--|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appear  | ars on the cover sheet with the c  | orrespondence add  | ress                                     |
| THE REPLY FILED <u>08-21-2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLIC   | CATION IN CONDITION FOR ALL  | OWANCE.  |  |
| <ol> <li>The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on<br/>application, applicant must timely file one of the following r<br/>application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe<br/>for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C<br/>periods:</li> </ol>   | eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavit<br>al (with appeal fee) in compliance                  | t, or other evidence, w<br>with 37 CFR 41.31; or           | hich places the (3) a Request            |
| a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date  | of the final rejection.  |  |  |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ac no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la   | dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth it<br>ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing       | date of the final rejection                                | n.                                       |
| Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b) MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f) Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of the control of th | ).   |  |  |
| have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extender 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the sl set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL   | ension and the corresponding amount on tened statutory period for reply original contents. | of the fee. The appropria<br>nally set in the final Office | ate extension fee<br>e action; or (2) as |
| 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl  | iance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be t  | iled within two month                                      | s of the date of                         |
| filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exten Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with  | sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to   | avoid dismissal of the                                     |  |
| AMENDMENTS   |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b</li> <li>They raise new issues that would require further con</li> </ol>   | sideration and/or search (see NOT  |  | cause                                    |
| (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below   | **   |  |  |
| (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or  |  |  | ne issues for                            |
| (d) They present additional claims without canceling a c   | orresponding number of finally reje  | ected claims.  |  |
| NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).   |  |  |  |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12   |  | mpliant Amendment (  | PTOL-324).                               |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):  |  |  |  |
| 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable claim(s).   |  |  | _  |
| 7. Solution For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prove The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:  |  | be entered and an e  | xplanation of                            |
| Claim(s) objected to:<br>Claim(s) rejected: <u>21-40</u> .   |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:   |  |  |  |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE  |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but<br/>because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and<br/>was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>  |  |  |  |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to over showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary   | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea  | ıl and/or appellant fail                                   | s to provide a                           |
| 10. $\square$ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation   | of the status of the claims after er   | ntry is below or attach                                    | ed.                                      |
| REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER  |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but<br/><u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></li> </ol>   |  | condition for allowan                                      | ce because:                              |
| 12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (l  | PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)   |  |  |
| 13.  Other:  |  |  |  |
| /Vivian Chin/  |  |  |  |
| Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2614   |  |  |  |
| ,  |  |  |  |

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant argued that it would not be obvious to modify Anderson to include a "means for transmitting a plurality of audio signals to the plurality of hearing devices" and requested the examiner to provide evidence to support the Official Notice (Remarks, pages 11-12).

In response, the examiner is providing U S patent 6,112,103 to Puthuff in the same field of endeavor. Puthuff teaches a communication system provides two-way wireless communication between a user and at least one remote device. The communication system comprises at least one earpiece worn by the user and a personal communication device for receiving and transmitting signals over a wireless link to and from the earpiece. Puthuff teaches a means for transmitting a plurality of audio signals to the plurality of hearing devices (see figure 1). Further, Anderson teaches a means for transmitting a plurality of audio signals to the plurality of hearing devices in that the three antennas 900, 960 and 970 (fig. 9) transmit a plurality of audio signals to a plurality of hearing devices (cell phones) at different frequencies. See col. 8, line 53 – col. 9, line 35. For at least these reasons, Anderson as modified meets the claimed limitations and the rejections are maintained.